UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,514	01/04/2001	Yasuyuki Fujikawa	1506.1002 (JDH)	3098

21171   7590   04/21/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 January 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1) If a copy of a provisional application listed on the bottom portion of the accompanying Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) form is not included with this Office action and the PTO-892 has been annotated to indicate that the copy was not readily available, it is because the copy could not be readily obtained when the Office action was mailed. Should applicant desire a copy of such a provisional application, applicant should promptly request the copy from the Office of Public Records (OPR) in accordance with 37 CFR 1.14(a)(1)(iv), paying the required fee under 37 CFR 1.19(b)(1). If a copy is ordered from OPR, the shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action will not be reset under MPEP § 710.06 unless applicant can demonstrate a substantial delay by the Office in fulfilling the order for the copy of the provisional application. Where the applicant has been notified on the PTO-892 that a copy of the provisional application is not readily available, the provision of MPEP § 707.05(a) that a copy of the cited reference will be automatically furnished without charge does not apply.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2-1)   Claims 1, 2,6,7,8, 9,10,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <u>Kuwahara</u> (US 6202072, filed Dec 1997).

Regarding claim 1, Kuwahara teaches "a reading module ... an identifier thereof" (ie., SGML conversion form generation module SGML document read-in module)(col 5, lines 1-18, lines 59-65).

Kuwahara teaches "a retrieving module which refers to the extraction ... target electronic document" (ie., prototype file of a plain text document)(col 5, lines 27, fig 2, item 105).

Kuwahara teaches "a structure document generating module ... the definition information" (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a user

Regarding claim 2, Kuwahara teaches "adds tags as an identifier ... said retrieving module... in front and rear of each region ...retrieving means " (ie., the data "Tokkyo Taro" set in the position in between tags <Name> and <\Name> tags ...)(col 6, lines 64-67, lines 45-48).

Regarding claim 6, 7, Kuwahara teaches "extraction condition ... whole region to be extracted" in claim 6 and "extraction condition ... end part thereof" in claim 7 (ie., Plain text document ... "document for Application" and corresponding end tag "document for application")(fig 3, item c)(ie., correlation therebetween as one unit)(col 5, lines 60-65).

Regarding claim 8, 9, Kuwahara teaches "description pattern ... to be extracted"
(ie., in the plain text document "application form for registering e-mail address"; data
displayed)(Fig 3, item a; col 6, lines 23-26).

Regarding claim 10, Kuwahara teaches "extraction condition ... syntax element
of the region to be extracted" (ie., text document is analyzed by software for syntax and
tags indicating a ... obtained syntax)(col 1, lines 31-40).

Regarding claim 11, Kuwahara teaches "reading ... text format", "reading ...
identifier thereof" (ie., conversion form generation module, document read-in
module)(col 5, lines 1-20, lines 59-63).

Kuwahara teaches "referring to ... reading step", "extracting ... electronic
document", "combining the regions ... definition information" (ie., specific form ..
concrete data ... name field, address field; data correlating)(col 6, lines 11-27; col 5,
lines 20-30; fig 2; fig 7, item 5).

Kuwahara teaches "generating ... definition information" (col 8, lines 33-38; fig 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3)   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3-1)   Claims 3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

<u>Kuwahara</u> **(as cited above), in view of** <u>Fong</u> **et al (US 2002/0085032 A1, effective**

filing date of Continuation Dec 1997).

Regarding claim 3, Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches

"correlation between the elements ... hierarchical structure ... hierarchy ... lower-order

hierarchy" (ie., hierarchical SGML document tree structure ... root note which has

children nodes)(para 90-93).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "retrieving module

extracts ... of the element in its higher-order hierarchy" (ie., transformation of a

hierarchical document tree structure; Map module 184)(para 90, fig 3A shows hierarchy;

para 93). Specifically, using Fong, users can map any object in a SGML tree to any

other object in the HTML tree, which includes mapping parents to children.

Kuwahara teaches "generating module adds tags in front and rear of the

region..." (col 6, lines 64-67).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "... all the elements in the

lower-order hierarchy" (ie., add an HTML tag from the Legal HTML Tag list box)(para

140)(ie., a list of legal HTML tags that can be added and inserted)(para 117)(ie., Map

module transforms from a hierarchical document tree to the another tree structure

document, which allows users to map from document hierarchical elements in a tree to

other hierarchical structures in any order: parent-child or child-parent)(para 117, Fig

12B, items 700-708).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara to include a structural document hierarchical mapping tree system that allows Markup language tags as taught by Fong, providing the benefit of creating and editing a mapping of structured information to different structured information, which allows a user to interactively define the map interactively (Fong, Abstract section, Title).

Regarding claim 5, Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "correlation between the elements ... hierarchical structure ... hierarchy ... lower-order hierarchy" (ie., hierarchical SGML document tree structure ... root note which has children nodes)(para 90-93).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "retrieving module extracts ... of the element in its higher-order hierarchy" (ie., transformation of a hierarchical document tree structure; Map module 184; Parser analyzes and breaks down input documents ...)(para 90, fig 3A shows hierarchy; para 93). Specifically, using Fong, users can map any object in a SGML tree to any other object in the HTML tree, which includes mapping parents to children.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara to include a structural document hierarchical mapping tree system as taught by Fong, providing the benefit of creating and editing a mapping of structured information to different structured information, which allows a user to interactively define the map interactively (Fong, Abstract section, Title).

3-2)   Claims 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwahara (as cited above), in view of Fong et al (US 2002/0085032 A1, effective filing date of Continuation Dec 1997), further in view of Poole (US 6006242, issued Dec 1999).

Regarding claim 4, Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Fong does teach "correlation between the element... a repetitive structure" (ie., the node section has children nodes and subsec. The subsec has children nodes... five levels)(para 91, fig 3A, item 1128).

Kuwahara in view of Fong does not expressly teach, but Poole teaches "retrieving module repeatedly ... of an element" (ie., repeating the steps in a document construction system)(col 7, lines 24-26; Fig 4, items 121, 133, 143).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "repetitive structure ... can be extracted" (ie., transforming and mapping data in the hierarchical tree structure corresponding to the SGML document... processing subsec nodes recursively for each level of the DTD)(para 90-93; fig 3A, tiem 128).

Kuwahara teaches "generating module ... tags...regions extracted"(ie., the tag "<para> ... </para>" in col 13, lines 55; start and end tag ... wrapped around the whole construct in col 23, lines 1-10). Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "retrieving module ... hierarchy"(ie., transformation of hierarchy tree... to another tree structure document)(para 90-93).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwhara to include transformation and mapping of a multi-leveled

repetitive node structure as taught by Fong, providing the benefit of creating and editing

a mapping of structured information to different structured information, which allows a

user to interactively define the map interactively (Fong, Abstract section, Title), further to

include repetitive steps in a document construction as taught by Poole, providing the

benefit of providing the benefit of dynamically constructing electronic and printable

documents such as in the form of a WWW page (Poole, para 2, lines 5-10, lines 45-50).

Other References

A.   1.   Murata (US 5694609, issued 12/97).

      2.   Prinzing (US 6480206, filed 2/99).

      3.   Zaharkin (US 20020147747, filed provisional app 60138979, Jun 1999).

      4.   Allouche et al (US 5459827, issued Oct 1995).

      5.   Chau et al (US 2002/0156772, provisional app 60168659, Dec 1999).

      6.   Madnick et al (US 5913214, issued Jun 1999).

      7.   Adler et al (US 6651218, filed Dec 1998).

      8.   Raman (US 6249794, filed Dec 1997).

      9.   Schloss et al (US 6249844, filed Nov 1998).

      10.   Shklar et al (US 6253239 Filed Nov 1999).

      11.   Imielinski et al (US 2002/0013792, provisional app 60173757, Dec 1999).

      12.   Poole et al (6006242, issued Dec 1999).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 703-305-8777. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703)305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER